

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 6-11 are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response because it is believed that the cancellation of claims 6-11 puts this application into condition for allowance

Claims 1-3 and 5 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In items 4-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over art Himmel (U.S.P. 6,237,035) and Murphy Jr, et al. (U.S.P. 6,061,741). (Action at pages 2-4.)

The rejections are traversed.

Applicants submit that features recited by claims 1-3 and 5 are not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination.

Independent claims 1 and 5 respectively recite a server and a computer-readable recording medium, using claim 1 as an example, affixing both "confirmation information for confirming display status of the client side to a result of the process" and "a liberal zone identification code to the result of the process performed by said processing means in the case the result is a page belonging to a group of pages previously defined as a liberal zone."

Further, claims 1 and 5 respectively recite a server and a computer-readable recording medium, using claim 1 as an example, "suspending the withholding of said withholding means when the request made again by the client contains the liberal zone identification code, thereby permitting execution of the request made again by the client."

Applicants submit that Himmel does not teach affixing such "a liberal zone identification code," let alone using claim 1 as an example, "suspending the withholding . . . when the request made again by the client contains the liberal zone identification code, thereby permitting execution of the request made again by the client." Rather, Himmel merely provides tranid, i.e., confirmation information alone.

In item 10 of the Office Action, entitled Response to Arguments, the Examiner contends:

Himmel clearly taught the action of "affixing" two codes separately. Himmel illustrates the actions of "affixing" a first code to all "forms", see column 5, lines 44-48 and "affixing" a second code to "embedded links", see column 5, lines 51-55.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's interpretation of Himmel is

not correct.

Rather, Himmel merely teaches that (col. 5, lines 41-42) "(d)uplicate detection on the server side is based on a transaction sequence number (transaction sequence number ("tranid"))."

Himmel further teaches that (see, for example, cols. 5-6, starting at line 43):

(a) transaction sequence number is assigned to each form sent to the browser for processing. The server detects any duplicate submission of a form containing a particular transaction sequence number. . . . When a page gets control to submit a transaction, the page must compare the tranid passed in the reference link to the tranid of the last completed transaction. If the tranid in the reference link is greater than last completed transaction tranid, then this is a new request from the user. The tranid from the reference is put into the last completed transaction tranid and the user's transaction is processed. If the tranid in the reference is less than or equal to the last completed transaction tranid, then the user's request is a duplicate and should not be processed again.

That is, Himmel does not teach affixing separate a liberal zone identification code (in addition to confirmation information), but rather merely a single tranid.

Murphy does not teach affixing separate confirmation information and a liberal zone identification code, but merely teaches the assignment of (see, for example col. 2, starting at line 41) "tokens that are unique identification strings."

Further, Applicants submit there is no motivation to modify Himmel, which teaches a single tranid information, so as to affix a liberal zone identification code and further to suspend withholding when the request made again by the client contains such a liberal zone identification code, thereby permitting execution of the request made again by the client.

Summary

Since features recited by independent claims 1 and 5 (and dependent claims 2-3) are not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination, there is no motivation to modify the art in a manner as the Examiner contends, and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-3 and 5 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 22, 2006

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501